UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/714,195 | 11/14/2003 | Joffre B. Baker | GHDX-005 | 5745 |
| | 7590 | EXAMINER | | |
| 1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE | | | SHAW, AMANDA MARIE | |
| SUITE 200 EAST PALO A | LTO, CA 94303 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1634 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/08/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Interview Summary | 10/714,195 | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| merview dummary | Examiner | | | | | |
| | Amanda Shaw | 1634 | | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): | | | | | | |
| (1) Amanda Shaw and Doug Schultz (in person). | (3) <u>Joffre Baker (by telepho</u> | one). | | | | |
| (2) Carl Francis (in person). | (4) <u>Kathleen Determann (b</u> | <u>y telephone)</u> . | | | | |
| Date of Interview: <u>01 September 2009</u> . | | | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant | 2)⊠ applicant's representative | e] | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e)⊠ No. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>31</u> . | | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Airenne et al (1996) Genomics 32:54</u> . | | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. ♀ | ງ)∐ was not reached. h)⊠ N | I/A. | | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The issues that were discussed are listed on the interview agenda (see attachment) that was submitted by applicants. The examiner indicated that she would fully consider any arguments or evidence present in the next response regarding the issue of whether the claims are enabled for the following ErbB1 inhibitors: erlotinib, cetuximab, or gefitinib. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILLING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | | |
| /Amanda Shaw/ | | | | | | |

Application No.

Applicant(s)